REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 18, 2006. Claims 2-10, 14, 16, 18, 29 and 30 are pending.

Claim 10

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takayama (US 5,982,345) in view of the Background of the Invention. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 10 requires, *inter alia*, that said voltage application means applies said prescribed electric fields in a manner such that said prescribed electric fields are always different from one another in polarity in all adjacent electrode pair regions and vary in a time-dependent manner." The cited art fails to disclose or suggest these features of claim 10, either taken alone or in the alleged combination.

The Office Action contends that Takayama discloses all features of claim 10 except for the light emission layer contacting one of the electrodes. This contention is incorrect for at least the following reasons. Claim 10 requires that "said voltage application means applies said prescribed electric fields in a manner such that *said prescribed electric fields are always different from one another in polarity in all adjacent electrode pair regions and vary in a time-dependent manner*." Takayama fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

Takayama provides a pair of EL elements in parallel with opposite polarities so that when voltage supplied to the elements is positive a first element emits light and when it is negative the other element emits light (col. 7, lines 5-12). However, Takayama does not disclose or suggest applying electric fields in a manner such that said electric fields are always different from one another in polarity in all adjacent electrode pair regions as required by claim 10. Table 4 in col.

8 of Takayama makes clear that the electric fields applied to adjacent electrode pair regions are *not* always different in polarity. For instance, at time t1 in Table 3 of Takayama, the same polarity is applied to all row electrodes and the same polarity is applied to all column electrodes; thus, the electric fields applied to all adjacent electrode pair regions cannot possibly be different in polarity at time t1 as required by claim 10. As another example, at time t3 in Table 3 of Takayama, the same polarity is applied to adjacent row electrodes R1 and R2 and the same polarity is applied to all column electrodes; thus, the electric fields applied to all adjacent electrode pair regions cannot possibly always be different in polarity at time t3 as required by claim 10.

In particular, Figs. 1 and 2A of Takayama disclose that each cell EL comprises a pair of display elements e1 and e2 coupled in parallel with opposite polarities; Fig. 2 shows that those elements e1 and e2 (reversely connected) in each pixel EL neighbor each other. However, according to Figs. 1 and 2A of Takayama, element e1 of pixel EL11 and element e1 of pixel EL21 neighbor each other; and when voltages are applied according to Table 4 the same voltage of the same polarity is applied at times t1 and t3 to element e1 of pixel EL11 and element e1 of pixel EL21 which neighbor each other.

Thus, because Takayama applies the same polarity to neighboring pixels in the same row (and in the same column, and e.g., to neighboring elements e1 as discussed above), the reference cannot possibly disclose or suggest the requirement of claim 10 that the prescribed electric fields are always different from each other in polarity in all adjacent electrode pair regions. Citation to the APA cannot cure the aforesaid flaws in Takayama. Thus, even the alleged combination (which applicant believes to be incorrect in any event) fails to meet the invention of claim 10.

Other Claims

Claim 14 requires "driving said organic EL emission device in a manner such that said prescribed electric fields at a given point in time are always different from each other in polarity as applied to all electrode pair regions that are adjacent to each other" and "an organic light emission layer for EL emission . . . injecting electric current into said organic light emission layer." Again, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest this aspect of claim 14, either taken alone or in the alleged combination.

New claims 29-30 require that *a common electrode drive pulse is twice as long as a segment electrode drive pulse* (e.g., see Fig. 3 of the instant application). The active matrix system of Takayama does not do this. Thus, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest this aspect of these claims, either taken alone or in the alleged combination.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100